PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

PCT

G.	2	8	SEP	2005
WIPO				PCT

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY

(Chapter II of the Patent Cooperation Treaty)

(PCT Article 36 and Rule 70)

Applicant's or agent's file reference SF-1074		FOR FURTHER ACT	ION	See Form PCT/IPEA/416		
ľ	mational application No. T/JP2004/011017	International filing date (da. 27.07.2004	y/month/year)	Priority date (day/month/year) 31.07.2003		
	mational Patent Classification (IPC) o 7C263/18, C07C265/04	or national classification and IPC				
	licant OWA DENKO K.K.					
1.	This report is the international Authority under Article 35 and	preliminary examination reportransmitted to the applicant a	ort, established by thi according to Article 3	s International Preliminary Examining 6.		
2.	This REPORT consists of a to	tal of 6 sheets, including this	cover sheet.			
3.	ANNEWS commission					
ĺ		nd to the international Bureau				
	sheets of the description, claims and/or drawings which have been amended and are the basis of this report and/or sheets containing rectifications authorized by this Authority (see Rule 70.16 and Section 607 of the Administrative Instructions).					
	beyond the disclos Supplemental Box	sure in the international applic	ation as filed, as ind	siders contain an amendment that goes icated in item 4 of Box No. I and the		
	coguence listing and/o	al Bureau only) a total of (ind r tables related thereto, in cor nce Listing (see Section 802	nouter readable forn	er of electronic carrier(s)) , containing a n only, as indicated in the Supplemental Instructions).		
4.	This report contains indication	ns relating to the following iter	ms:			
	Box No. I Basis of the	opinion				
	☐ Box No. II Priority	•				
	☑ Box No. III Non-establi	shment of opinion with regard	I to novelty, inventive	e step and industrial applicability		
		y of invention				
	applicability	; citations and explanations s	with regard to noveli supporting such state	ty, inventive step or industrial ement		
		uments cited				
		ects in the international applic				
	☑ Box No. VIII Certain obs	servations on the international	application			
Da	te of submission of the demand		Date of completion of	his report		
20	0.01.2005		27.09.2005			
Na pre	me and mailing address of the interreliminary examining authority:		Authorized Officer	No. 1		
-	European Patent Office D-10958 Berlin	Gitschiner Str. 103	Rufet, J	(0) 		
-	Tel. +49 30 25901 - 0 Fax: +49 30 25901 - 840		Telephone No. +49 30	25901-		

17.

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY

International application No. PCT/JP2004/011017

_							
_	Box No. I Basis	s of the report					
1	. With regard to the language , this report is based on the international application in the language in which it will filled, unless otherwise indicated under this item.						
2	This report is based on translations from the original language into the following language, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of: international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)) publication of the international application (under Rule 12.4) international preliminary examination (under Rules 55.2 and/or 55.3) With regard to the elements* of the international application, this report is based on (replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this report as "originally filed" and are not annexed to this report):						
	Description, Pages						
	1-22	as originally filed					
	Claims, Numbers						
	1-17	as originally filed					
	☐ a sequence lis	ting and/or any related table(s) - see Supplemental Box Relating to Sequence Listing					
3.	☐ the descrip☐ the claims,☐ the drawing☐ the sequen☐	Nos.					
4.	Supplemental Box the descript the claims, the drawing the sequence	ion, pages Nos.					
		oplies, some or all of these sheets may be marked "superseded."					

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY

International application No. PCT/JP2004/011017

						
_		x No. III Non-establishment of plicability	of op	inion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial		
1.	The	ne questions whether the claimed invention appears to be novel, to involve an inventive step (to be non- ovious), or to be industrially applicable have not been examined in respect of:				
		the entire international application,				
	Ø	claims Nos. 1-5,7-10,12-15,17 all partly				
		because:				
		the said international application, or the said claims Nos. relate to the following subject matter which does not require an international preliminary examination (specify):				
		the description, claims or draw that no meaningful opinion cou	ings Id be	(indicate particular elements below) or said claims Nos. are so unclear formed (specify):		
		the claims, or said claims Nos. could be formed.	are s	so inadequately supported by the description that no meaningful opinion		
	×	no international search report h	as b	een established for the said claims Nos. 1-5,7-10,12-15,17 all partly		
		the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing does not comply with the standard provided for in Annex C of the Administrative Instructions in that:				
		the written form		has not been furnished		
				does not comply with the standard		
		the computer readable form		has not been furnished		
				does not comply with the standard		
		the tables related to the nucleonot comply with the technical re	tide a equire	and/or amino acid sequence listing, if in computer readable form only, do ements provided for in Annex C-bis of the Administrative Instructions.		
		See separate sheet for further of	detail	s .		

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY

International application No. PCT/JP2004/011017

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)

Yes: Claims

6,7,11,16

1-17

No: Claims

1-5,8-10,12-15,17

Inventive step (IS)

Yes: Claims

No: Claims

io. Ciaims

1-17

Industrial applicability (IA)

Yes: Claims No: Claims

2. Citations and explanations (Rule 70.7):

see separate sheet

Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the question whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:

see separate sheet

PCT/JP2004/011017

Re Item III.

Present claims 1-5, 7-10,12-15,17 relate to an extremely large number of possible processes, due to the use of the vague expression "a dissolved acidic gas". Support within the meaning of Article 6 PCT and/or disclosure within the meaning of Article 5 PCT is to be found, however, for only a very small proportion of the processes claimed. In the present case, the claims so lack support, and the application so lacks disclosure, that a meaningful examination over the whole of the scope is impossible. The international search report has not been established for the part of claims 1-5, 7-10,12-15,17 which appear not to be supported and disclosed. Consequently, the examination has only been carried out for those parts of claims which appear to be supported and disclosed (Art. 34(4)(a)(ii) PCT) and which have been searched (Rule 66.1(e) PCT), namely those parts relating to the processes according to claims 1-17 wherein the "dissolved acidic gas" is selected from carbon dioxide, sulfur dioxide or nitrogen monoxide according to page 10, I. 19-20 of the description.

Re Item V.

1. The following documents are referred to in this communication:

D1: DE 32 25 247 A

D2: DATABASE WPI, AN 1982-61474E; JP 59 007147 A

D3: DATABASE WPI, AN 1990-214434; JP 02 145555 A

D4: US-A-3247236

2. Novelty

- 2.1 The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject-matter of claims 1-5, 8-10, 12-15, 17 is in view of the teaching of D1-D3 not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT. Documents D1-D3 disclose stabilized (meth)acryloyloxyalkyl isocyanate obtained by using nitrogen oxide or sulfur dioxide gas during distillation (see D1, p. 5-10, claims; D2, abstract; D3 abstract).
- 2.2 Document D2 refers to the use of carbon dioxide or sulfur dioxide gas for stabilizing organic isocyanate compounds, whereby (meth)acryloyloxyalkyl isocyanate are not mentioned. The claimed subject-matter is therefore considered to be novel over D4.

3. Inventive step

The subject-matter of claims 6, 11 and 16 is in view of the technical teaching of the prior art documents D1-D3 in combination with D4 considered as obvious for a skilled person for the following reasons:

Starting from the equally closest prior art documents D1, D2 or D3, the problem underlying the present invention is to be seen in the provision of a further process for stabilizing (meth)acryloyloxyalkyl isocyanate compounds.

The proposed solution according to claims 6, 10 and 11 is to dissolved carbon dioxide in the (meth)acryloyloxyalkyl isocyanate instead of nitrogen oxide or sulfur dioxide as disclosed in D1-D3.

From the teaching of D4 the skilled person knows already that sulfur dioxide and carbon dioxide are equally effective for stabilizing liquid organic isocyanates (see D4, column 1, I. 55-64). The skilled person would have therefore, with expectation of success, considered to replace sulfur dioxide by carbon dioxide in the processes of D1, D2 or D3 as an alternative, if he wanted to provide a further process for stabilizing (meth)acryloyloxyalkyl isocyanate compounds.

Consequently the subject-matter of claims 6, 10 and 11 does not meet the criteria of Article 33(3) PCT.

Re Item VIII.

- 1. it is stressed that an unclear expression like "dissolved acidic gas" cannot be allowed in a claim if the term is essential having regard to the invention, which is the case in present claim 1, contrary to the requirements of Art. 6 PCT. Equally, an unclear term cannot be used by the applicant to distinguish his invention from the prior art.
- 2. Claim 8 does not meet the requirements of Article 6 PCT in that the matter for which protection is sought is not clearly defined. The claim attempts to define the subject-matter in terms of the result to be achieved (due to the expression "forcedly dissolving"), which merely amounts to a statement of the underlying problem, without providing the technical features necessary for achieving this result.
- 3. Claims 13-17 are considered to be redundant in view of claims 8-12, because the expression "a process for stabilizing a (meth)acryloyloxyalkyl isocyanate" of claims 8-12 and the expression "a process for preparing a stabilized (meth)acryloyloxyalkyl isocyanate" of claims 13-17 are equivalent.